ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

INSTALLATION MASTER PLAN FOR FORT DETRICK, MARYLAND



Prepared by:

U.S. Army Garrison Fort Detrick, MD 21702

With Technical Assistance from:

BSA Environmental Services, Inc. Beachwood, OH 44122

Contract No. GS10F0095J

1 September 2003



ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

INSTALLATION MASTER PLAN FOR FORT DETRICK, MARYLAND

September 2003

Prepared by: U.S. Army Garrison Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702

Reviewed by:			Reviewed by:
/signed/			/signed/
Rod S. Sheffer Environmental Engineer Safety, Environment and Integrated Planning Office U.S. Army Garrison			M. Turner Pope, Jr., CPT, JA Office of Command Judge Advocate U.S. Army Garrison
Reviewed by:			Reviewed by:
/signed/			/signed/
Donald F. Archibald Lieutenant Colonel, MS Director, Safety, Environmen Integrated Planning Office U.S. Army Garrison	t and		Robert P. Craig, P.E. Chief, Environmental Management U.S. Army Garrison
		Approved by:	
	/signed/ John E. E	3all	
		U.S. Army	

Commander



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared in accordance with guidance provided in Army Regulation (AR) 200-2, *Environmental Effects of Army Actions*, dated March 29, 2002, implementing the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) (42 U.S. Code (USC) 4321-4347). The U.S. Army Garrison (USAG), Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland prepared this EA with assistance from BSA Environmental Services, Inc. and Analytical Services, Inc. This document has been printed on recycled paper.

This EA characterizes and analyzes the probable and possible environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action at Fort Detrick, Maryland. Any contemplated or likely action is considered a proposed activity, whether or not it materializes. This analysis considers impacts expected from current and proposed Installation activities, cumulative impacts that might occur after several years and impacts resulting from association with other activities in the area.

The Proposed Action and subject of this EA is to Implement the Land Use Plan for Fort Detrick, Maryland (Alternative I, the preferred alternative). The Proposed Action includes:

- Demolition of some existing buildings which are poorly situated, energy inefficient, and maintenance intensive. Because of distances among buildings, their operation results in wasted time when in-person coordination among offices and activities is required. These buildings were initially designed for an activity other than the one currently served or to house the activity temporarily. Some of these buildings were constructed during World War II (WWII) as temporary structures. The 23 buildings which will be demolished occupy approximately 152,000 gross square feet (gsf) of space;
- New construction of four better situated, energy efficient buildings to replace those demolished. The approximate size of the new buildings will be 169,000 gsf;
- Infrastructural improvements to Fort Detrick including reconfiguration of the Main Gate, Old Farm Gate, Opossumtown Gate, and internal roads. Additional parking lots and reconfiguration of some existing parking lots are included. These improvements to the gates and roadways will alleviate traffic congestion while providing improved security for the Installation workforce and residents of Fort Detrick;
- Designation of an approximately 200-acre area within Area A for a new BioMedical Research Park. Installation of roads and initial utilities to serve future tenants with biomedical research and development missions is included;
- Increased recreational opportunities for the workforce and residents of Fort Detrick;
- Enhancement of educational opportunities for children of Fort Detrick residents:
- Expansion of wetlands and increased forestation; and a
- Variety of security upgrades to protect both the workforce and residents of Fort Detrick.

During the preparation of this EA, one alternative to the Proposed Action was identified. This alternative is Do Not Implement the Land Use Plan for Fort Detrick, Maryland (Alternative II, No Action).

This EA characterizes the reasonably predictable environmental impacts that might result from implementation of the Proposed Action and the alternative.

Possible negligible to minor adverse impacts associated with construction include:

- potential minor impacts to soils;
- · negligible impacts to water resources;
- · minor impacts to wetlands;
- · minor impacts to plants and animals;
- minor impacts to air quality;
- minor impacts to historical and cultural resources due to fugitive dust during construction;
- positive impacts to the local socioeconomic environment (the City of Frederick);
- minor impacts from noise;
- negligible impacts from odors;
- potential minor impacts to traffic off-post from construction vehicles;
- minor impacts to energy resources;
- negligible impacts to waste streams; and
- negligible impacts to human health and safety.

Possible negligible to minor adverse impacts, and positive impacts associated with operation include:

- minor adverse impacts (loss of agricultural land) and positive impacts (consolidation of similar activities on the Installation, gain of forested land, and increased wetlands) to land use;
- · negligible impacts to soils;
- positive impacts to wetlands;
- positive impacts to plant and animal ecology (creation of high quality habitat);
- negligible impacts to air quality:
- positive impacts to historical and cultural resources (protective tree buffers, interpretive trails);
- positive impacts to the Fort Detrick socioeconomic environment (residents of Fort Detrick);
- positive impacts to housing on Fort Detrick;
- negligible impacts from noise;
- negligible impacts from odors;
- positive impacts to traffic from gate reconfigurations and roadway expansions;
- positive impacts to security;
- negligible impacts to energy resources:
- negligible impacts to waste streams;
- possible minor impacts to nearby residents from nuisance lighting (ball fields and running track); and
- negligible impacts to human health and safety.

All of the potential adverse impacts resulting from the implementation of the Proposed Action were deemed to be negligible to minor and mitigatable, provided that Best Management Practices (BMPs) are strictly adhered to during construction/demolition and operation of the proposed facilities.

The principal conclusions of this EA are: (1) implementing Alternative I (the preferred alternative) would result in no significant adverse environmental impacts, provided that BMPs to mitigate these potential environmental impacts are adhered to during construction/demolition and operation of the facilities; (2) implementing the Proposed Action will provide Fort Detrick

with much-needed infrastructural improvements which will increase efficiency and allow USAG and its tenants to achieve their respective mission requirements; (3) implementing the Land Use Plan for Fort Detrick (the Proposed Action) will increase recreational opportunities and security for the workforce and residents of Fort Detrick; (4) implementing Alternative I will expand and enhance the natural resources areas of the Installation; (5) implementing Alternative I is consistent with the land use planning objectives for Fort Detrick; (6) implementing Alternative II (No Action) would not provide Fort Detrick with much-needed infrastructural facilities and would hamper the ability of USAG and its tenants to meet their respective mission requirements; (7) implementing Alternative II (No Action) is not consistent with land use planning objectives for Fort Detrick; and (8) implementing the No Action alternative would eliminate the negligible to minor environmental impacts associated with the implementation of Alternative I, but would also eliminate the beneficial impacts of the Proposed Action.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT – FORT DETRICK INSTALLATION MASTER PLAN FORT DETRICK, MARYLAND – 1 SEPTEMBER 2003 THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Sec</u>	<u>tion</u>			<u>Page</u>
		EXEC	UTIVE SUMMARY	i
1.0	PUF	RPOSE	AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION	1-1
	1.1	MISSI	ON REQUIREMENTS	1-2
	1.2	STRA	TEGIC PLAN	1-2
	1.3	ASSES	SSMENT APPROACH	1-3
	1.4	OBJE	CTIVES OF THE INSTALLATION MASTER PLAN EA	1-5
	1.5	ORGA	NIZATION OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	1-5
2.0	DES	CRIPTI	ON OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	2-1
	2.1	LOCA	TION OF THE INSTALLATION	2-1
	2.2	ORGA	NIZATION OF THE INSTALLATION	2-1
	2.3	HISTO	PRY OF THE INSTALLATION	2-2
	2.4	CURR	ENT OPERATIONS	2-3
		2.4.1	Research And Development	2-3
		2.4.2	Military Medical Program Support	2-8
		2.4.3	Other Operations	2-8
	2.5	CHANGES IN LAND USE		2-9
		2.5.1	Administration	2-10
		2.5.2	Research and Development	2-34
		2.5.3	Infrastructure/Operations/Communications	2-36
		2.5.4	Agriculture	2-40
		2.5.5	Military Housing	2-40
		2.5.6	Community Services	2-41
		2.5.7	Natural Resources/Historical Resources/Recreation	2-43
	2.6	SITE S	SELECTION	2-45
	2.7	CONS	TRUCTION AND DEMOLITION REGULATIONS AND CONSTRAIN	TS2-46
		2.7.1	Construction/Demolition Waste Management	2-46
		2.7.2	Best Management Practices (BMPs)	2-46
		2.7.3	Air Quality Requirements	2-47
		2.7.4	Erosion and Sediment Control, and Stormwater Management	2-47
		2.7.5	Forest Conservation and Cultural Resource Requirements	2-47
		2.7.6	Energy Efficient Design of New Facilities	2-48

		2.7.7	Utility Requirements for Routine Operations	2-48
		2.7.8	Waste Stream Management and Pollution Prevention	2-55
3.0	ALT	ERNAT	IVES CONSIDERED	3-1
	3.1 MAR		RNATIVE I – IMPLEMENT THE LAND USE PLAN FOR FORT DETRICK,	
	3.2 DETF		RNATIVE II – DO NOT IMPLEMENT THE LAND USE PLAN FOR FORT ARYLAND – (NO ACTION)	3-1
4.0	AFF	ECTED	ENVIRONMENT	4-1
	4.1	LOCA	TION AND LAND USE	4-1
		4.1.1	Adjacent Land Use	4-1
		4.1.2	Fort Detrick Land Use	4-3
	4.2	CLIMA	TE	4-8
	4.3	GEOL	OGY	4-9
		4.3.1	Piedmont Plateau Physiographic Province	4-9
		4.3.2	Regional Geology	4-9
		4.3.3	Sinkholes and Depressions	4-10
		4.3.4	Fracture Traces and Lineaments	4-11
		4.3.5	Seismic Conditions	4-11
	4.4	SOILS		4-11
	4.5	WATE	R RESOURCES	4-12
		4.5.1	Surface Water	.4-12
		4.5.2	Groundwater	4-14
		4.5.3	Drinking Water	4-15
		4.5.4	Wastewater	4-17
		4.5.5	Enhanced Nutrient Removal Policy	4-20
		4.5.6	Stormwater	4-21
	4.6	WETL	ANDS	4-23
	4.7	PLANT	TAND ANIMAL ECOLOGY	4-24
		4.7.1	Vegetation	4-25
		4.7.2	Wildlife	4-26
		4.7.3	Special Status Species	4-28
	4.8	AIR QI	JALITY	4-29
		4.8.1	Frederick Region Classification	4-29
		4.8.2	Fort Detrick Air Pollution Sources	4-31

	4.8.3	Hazardous and Toxic Air Pollutants	4-33
4.9	HISTO	RICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES	4-33
	4.9.1	History	4-33
	4.9.2	Cultural Resources	4-34
	4.9.3	Archeological Resources	4-35
4.10	SOCIO	ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT	4-37
4.11	HOUSI	NG	4-40
4.12	NOISE		4-41
4.13	ODOR	S	4-41
4.14	TRANS	SPORTATION	4-43
	4.14.1	Access to Fort Detrick	4-43
	4.14.2	Vehicular Transportation	4-44
	4.14.3	Existing Parking Conditions at Fort Detrick	4-45
	4.14.4	Public Transportation	4-45
	4.14.5	Railways	4-45
	4.14.6	Aviation	4-46
4.15	SECURITY4-		
4.16	ENER	GY RESOURCES	4-47
4.17	MUNIC	CIPAL SOLID WASTE	4-48
	4.17.1	Fort Detrick Incinerator Complex	4-48
	4.17.2	Fort Detrick Municipal Landfill	4-50
4.18	HAZAF	RDOUS MATERIAL MANAGEMENT	4-52
4.19	HAZAF	RDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT	4-54
4.20	MEDIC	AL WASTE	4-56
4.21	RADIO	LOGICAL WASTE	4-57
4.22	PESTI	CIDES	4-59
	4.22.1	Integrated Pest Management Approach	4-59
	4.22.2	Pesticide Storage, Mixing, and Transportation	4-59
	4.22.3	Pesticide Application	4-60
4.23	FORT	DETRICK ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS	4-61
	4.23.1	Restoration Advisory Board	4-61
	4.23.2	Area A Environmental Concerns	4-61
	4.23.3	Area B Environmental Concerns	4-65
	4.23.4	Area C Environmental Concerns	4-69

		4.23.5	Land Use Constraints	4-70
5.0	ENV	IRONMI	ENTAL CONSEQUENCES	5-1
	5.1	INTRO	DUCTION	5-1
	5.2	ENVIR	ONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	5-1
		5.2.1	Land Use	5-1
		5.2.2	Climate	5-2
		5.2.3	Geology	5-2
		5.2.4	Soils	5-2
		5.2.5	Water Resources	5-2
		5.2.6	Wetlands	5-3
		5.2.7	Plant and Animal Ecology	5-4
		5.2.8	Air Quality	5-4
		5.2.9	Historical and Cultural Resources	5-5
		5.2.10	Socioeconomic Environment	5-6
		5.2.11	Housing	5-6
		5.2.12	Noise	5-6
		5.2.13	Odors	5-7
		5.2.14	Transportation	5-7
		5.2.15	Security	5-9
		5.2.16	Energy Resources	5-10
		5.2.17	Waste Streams	5-10
		5.2.18	Public Opinion	5-10
		5.2.19	Human Health and Safety	5-11
		5.2.20	Environmental Justice	5-11
		5.2.21	Cumulative Impacts	5-11
	5.3 MAR`		NATIVE I - IMPLEMENT THE LAND USE PLAN FOR FORT DETRICK	
	5.4 DETF		NATIVE II - DO NOT IMPLEMENT THE LAND USE PLAN FOR FORT ARYLAND (NO ACTION)	5-13
6.0	CON	ICLUSIO	ONS	6-1
7.0	REF	ERENC	ES	7-1
8.0	ACR	RONYMS	S AND ABBREVIATIONS	8-1
9.0	PER	SONS A	AND AGENCIES CONTACTED	9-1

10.0 LIST OF PREPARERS10-1
LIST OF FIGURES (Figures removed due to the size of the electronic file, and for security purposes. Hardcopies are located in the Fort Detrick and C. Burr Artz Libraries.)
Figure 2-1. Regional Location Map.
Figure 2-2. Area Location Map.
Figure 2-3. Mission Land Allocations Map - Area A.
Figure 2-4. Existing Land Use Map - Area A.
Figure 2-5. Existing Land Use Map - Area B.
Figure 2-6. Future Land Use Plan - Area A.
Figure 2-7. Future Land Use Plan - Area B.
Figure 2.8. Future Functional Relationships Plan - Area A.
Figure 2-9. Future Construction Projects - Area A (also see Appendix B).
Figure 2-10. Detailed Future Construction Projects - Area A (also see Appendix B).
Figure 2-11. Proposed Changes to Roadways - Area A.
Figure 2-12. Forestation Plan - Area A.
Figure 2-13. Forestation Plan - Area B.
Figure 4-1. Location of Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland4-1
Figure 4-2. Land Use Adjacent to Area A and Area B.
Figure 4-3. Geological Map - Area A.
Figure 4-4. Geological Map - Area B.
Figure 4-5. Soils Map - Area A.
Figure 4-6. Soils Map - Area B.
Figure 4-7. Schematic Representation of Operations at the Water Treatment Plant.
Figure 4-8. Schematic Representation of Flow in the Wastewater Treatment Plant.
Figure 4-9. Wetlands Map - Area A.
Figure 4-10, Wetlands Man - Area B

- Figure 4-12. Forest Blocks Map Area B.
- Figure 4-13. Archeological Sites Map Area A.
- Figure 4-14. Archeological Sites Map Area B.
- Figure 4.15. Land Use Constraints Map of Fort Detrick.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1. Current Fort Detrick Tenants and Their Associated Missions/Operations	2-4
Table 2-2. NEPA Status of Installation Projects by Land Use.	.2-11
Table 2-3. Buildings to be Demolished on Area A as Part of the Proposed Action	.2-35
Table 2-4. Projected Impervious Surface Area for Construction Projects	.2-49
Table 2-5. Projected Permanent Land Disturbance for Construction Projects	.2-51
Table 2-6. Existing and Projected Annual Utility Requirements and Waste Streams for Fort Detrick	.2-53
Table 4-1. Monthly Average of Chemical Additives (In Pounds) for the WTP	.4-16
Table 4-2. Fort Detrick Total Water Production and Wastewater Generation	.4-16
Table 4-3. Effluent Limitations from the Fort Detrick's WWTP NPDES Permit	.4-21
Table 4-4. National Ambient Air Quality Standards	.4-29
Table 4-5. Major Air Emissions Sources in Frederick County, MD	.4-31
Table 4-6. Actual Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions at Fort Detrick in 2002	.4-32
Table 4-7. Employment Categories of Frederick County Residents	.4-38
Table 4-8. Frederick County Labor Force Occupational Classifications.	.4-38
Table 4-9. Projected Population Growth for Fort Detrick	.4-39
Table 4-10. Fort Detrick Refuse Disposal (On-site) During 2000, 2001, and 2002	.4-51
Table 4-11. Material Recycled at Fort Detrick in 2002	.4-51
Table 4-12. Fort Detrick 2002 Tier II Summary	.4-53
Table 4-13. NCI-Frederick 2002 Tier II Summary	.4-53

Table 4-14. 1998 - 2002. RCRA Annual Hazardous Waste Quantities.	4-55
Table 4-15. 2001 RCRA Hazardous Waste Quantities Generated by Activity	4-55
Table 4-16. Total Medical Waste Incinerated.	4-57
Table 4-17. Parcels with Potential Restrictions on Area B of Fort Detrick	4-102
Table 5-1. Fort Detrick's Potential Contribution to Future Intersection Loadings	5-9
Table 5-2. Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action Related to Construction and Demolition.	
Table 5-3. Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts Related to Operation of the Propo	
Table 5-4. Summary of Mitigation Measures.	5-18
LIST OF APPENDICIES (Appendices removed due to the size of the electronic file, and for security purposes. Hardcopies are located in the Fort Detrick and C. Burr Artz Libraries.)	
APPENDIX A: EAS AND EISS PERFORMED AT FORT DETRICK	
APPENDIX B: CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS SITE PHOTOS	
APPENDIX C: ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	
APPENDIX D: SUMMARY OF 2001 ECAS FINDINGS	
APPENDIX E: PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS SITE DRAWINGS	
APPENDIX F: INSTALLATION FUTURE BASELINE UTILITY CONSUMPTION AND WASTE STREAMS	
APPENDIX G: PHOTOGEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS	
APPENDIX H: FORT DETRICK STORMWATER/SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT AREAS	
APPENDIX I: FORT DETRICK VEGETATIVE SPECIES	
APPENDIX J: FORT DETRICK BIRD SPECIES	
APPENDIX K: FORT DETRICK MAMMAL SPECIES	
APPENDIX L: FORT DETRICK AIR QUALITY	
APPENDIX M: ENERGY RESOURCES	

APPENDIX N: PESTICIDE USE AND ASSOCIATED TARGETS

APPENDIX O: PESTICIDE INVENTORY/USAGE

APPENDIX P: FORT DETRICK EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT – FORT DETRICK INSTALLATION MASTER PLAN FORT DETRICK, MARYLAND – 1 SEPTEMBER 2003 THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK